

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

United States Courts Southern
District of Texas
FILED

SEP 20 2021

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk of Court

BOBBIE LEE HAVERKAMP
PLAINTIFF

VS.

CIVIL ACTION
2:17-CV-18

DEFENDANTS ACTING FOR
DIRECTORS OF MENTAL
MEDICAL HEALTH POLICY
G-51.11 DATED 5/16/2012
DEFENDANTS

OBJECTION, A STRONG
OBJECTION TO THE COMMITTEE
BEING NAMED AS DEFENDANTS

OBJECTIONS TO THE COMMITTEE
BEING NAMED AS DEFENDANTS

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT
NOW COMES, MS. BOBBIE
AKA THE PLAINTIFF AND STRONGLY OBJECTS TO THE
DEFENDANTS IN THE 5TH CIRCUIT # 20-90337 BEING PUT
IN AS THE COMMITTEE WHEN THE PLAINTIFF NEVER
SUED ANYONE IN THE COMMITTEE.

ALLOWING THE DEFENDANTS TO SLIP IN AND
INSERT THEIRSELVES THAT I SUED THE COMMITTEE
CHANGES THE ENTIRE ARGUMENT AND GIVES
THEM A UNFAIR ADVANTAGE.

YOUR HONOR, THE COMMITTEE IS NOT INVOLVED ON A DAILY BASIS — YOU WILL HAVE A DIFFICULT TIME CONNECTING THE COMMITTEE, YES, I GOT THEM CONNECTED THRU TWO INTERPRETATIONS OF POLICY WHICH THE COURT WILL HAVE TO RULE ON THE INTENT OF THE POLICY, BUT IN THE LARGE SCHEME OF THE CIVIL SUIT, ITS THE DIRECTORS OF MENTAL/MEDICAL HEALTH THAT IN POLICY G-S1.11 DATED 5/16/2012 THAT OUTLINES WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE TREATMENT PLANS FOR GENDER DYSPORIA.

YOUR HONOR, I STRONGLY OBJECT — THE DEFENDANTS IN THE 2ND AMENDED COMPLAINTS IS THE DIRECTORS OF MENTAL/MEDICAL HEALTH, NO ONE ELSE.

I WOULD LIKE TO LODGE A OBJECTION WITH THE 5TH CIRCUIT, THE COMMITTEE WAS NOT THE DEFENDANTS, THE DIRECTORS OF MENTAL/MEDICAL HEALTH WERE NAMED IN THE 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT, I CAN CONNECT THE "DIRECTORS".

THIS IS JUST MORE LEGAL TRICKERY OF THE TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERAL CORBELLO, AND SHIFT THE ARGUMENT TO HER FAVOR, YOUR HONOR, TAKE THE COMMITTEE OUT OF THE 5TH CIRCUITS ARGUEMENT, CORBELLO DOESN'T HAVE A LEG TO STAND ON. ITS 12 MONTHS ON HORMONES THEN GRS.

ITS LEGAL TRICKERY AND MISCONSTRUING THE FACTS WHEN THE FACTS ARE THE PLAINTIFF SUED THE DIRECTORS

OF MENTAL/MEDICAL HEALTH IN POLICY G-SI.11 DATED 5/16/2012.

I AM PRESENTING THIS UNDER DOUGLASS -V- UNITED SERV. AUTO ASS., 79 F3d 1415 (5TH CIR. 1990), ITS PLAIN ERROR TO ALLOW THE DEFENDANTS TO REPRESENT THEMSELVES AS THE "COMMITTEE" WHEN THE COMMITTEE HAS NEVER BEEN SUED.

THE PLAINTIFF OBJECTS AND OBJECTS STRONGLY — PLEASE PRESENT THE OBJECTION TO THE 5TH CIRCUIT.

YOUR HONOR, THE LEGAL QUESTION OF WHO IS REPRESENTED AS DEFENDANTS WAS FILED WITH THE 2ND AMENDED COMPLAINT AND NEEDS TO BE ANSWERED BEFORE THE 2ND AMENDED COMPLAINT IS SERVED.

YOUR HONOR, THE TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERAL USE LEGAL TRICKERY TO GO AROUND THE COURTS RULING, THE 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT CONNECTS THE DIRECTORS OF MENTAL/MEDICAL HEALTH.

CORBELLO ASSERTED THE "COMMITTEE", SHE DIDN'T HAVE A ARGUMENT AS "DIRECTORS", THE DIRECTORS WERE AUTOMATICALLY CONNECTED IN POLICY G-SI.11 DATED 5/16/2012 PG. 4.

THE 5TH CIRCUIT TOOK THE DEFENDANTS AS NAMED — NOT SO. PLEASE FILE THE OBJECTION.

SO PRAYS THE PLAINTIFF

Ms Bobbie

9-14-2021